

BW401
C8 R4

(THE REV. G. CUBITT'S

ANSWER TO

DR. WARREN'S "SUFFICIENT REPLY"

TO MR. CUBITT'S FORMER PAMPHLET.)

POSTSCRIPT.

In a new edition of the Appendix to his pamphlet, Dr. Warren devotes half a page to my "Observations." Had he contented himself with "calling names," I should have taken no notice of what he has said. Hard words break no bones. But as he selects *one* of my statements for denial, and gives that as a specimen of the rest, I meet him on his own ground. Issue is now fairly joined. The Doctor's main charge against me is that of "*a culpable disregard of veracity.*" And certainly, as the case now stands, either I have wilfully stated a positive falsehood, or Dr. Warren has. I meet him on this ground, and leave the decision to any really IMPARTIAL judge. At the hazard of being again told of my "*lengthy reply,*" I will quote the whole of this part of the case, and thus give my readers a full opportunity of judging for themselves.

Dr. Warren says in his pamphlet, (as I have quoted, page 14.) "It was at this meeting that certain modifications of the plan, as left at the October Committee, were proposed for approbation. I STATED AT ONCE, that in consequence of what had occurred at the October Committee, and the subsequent correspondence, I was constrained to dissent in principle from the entire project."

On this I have remarked,

1. "I say, Sir, that he did not thus state his dissent *at once*. The real state of the case is this: So soon as the meeting was ready to proceed to business, Mr. Bunting asked whether Dr. Warren were still friendly to the principle of the Institution, or whether, since the October meetings, he had changed his opinions. Above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought to give an unevasive reply to this plain question," &c. (Page 14.)

2. "When the meeting had been opened, and the Minutes of the Provisional Committee confirmed in the usual way, that is, as being a true record of proceedings, Mr. Bunting asked whether the Doctor was, or whether he was not, friendly to the *principle* of a measure, modifications of which were about to be proposed. After several persons, as I have already stated, had endeavoured to elicit a reply, the one was given which I have mentioned before, 'In

consequence of the *disingenuous* and *interested* conduct which has been practised, I have certainly changed my opinion.' " (Page 37.)

The reply now published by the Doctor is as follows:—

"THE REV. GEORGE CUBITT, next to the *veracious* Jonathan Crowther, has done me the honour of the most lengthy reply. The principal difference of character in these adventurous performers is, that the former, through inferior scholarship and coarser manners, possesses still less ability than the latter, to conceal the deep mortification felt by him and his party, at the exposure of their sinister designs, under the *pretext* of a better mode of training our junior preachers, to construct an engine for more successfully strengthening a dominant episcopal faction! In one thing they most perfectly coincide---a *culpable disregard of veracity*!---Take one instance: At page 9, third Edition, of the 'REMARKS,' I have said, that 'I at once stated my dissent from the entire project.' Against this the Rev. George Cubitt has the hardihood to say, 'that above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought give an unequivocal reply to this plain question,' i. e. Whether I approved of the modified plan of the Institution.---To which I did *instantly* give what I intended to be, an unequivocal denial; and upon being told that I had not answered satisfactorily, I *immediately* replied, 'That nothing was further from my intention than to disguise my sentiments,' and subjoined these words, 'That I dissented in principle from the entire project.' So far from *truth* is the Rev. George Cubitt's statement,---'That I evaded the question for an hour,' that I challenge every one, who was attentive to what passed, to bear witness in *His* presence, where no falsehood can escape detection, that I did not *for one moment* evade the most explicit answer which I could put into words!---Other statements, equally remote from truth, disgrace almost every page of the REV. GEORGE CUBITT's vulgar and impudent Pamphlet! The one I have given is a sufficient specimen."

And now for my own reply. Whether true or false, it shall be unequivocal.

1. As to *inferior scholarship, coarser manners, vulgarity, and impudence*, I am quite content to let them go for as much as they are worth. But what have they to do with the questions really at issue?

2. The Doctor is again practising, what I now ADVISEDLY call, his UNPRINCIPLED plan of keeping back essential parts of the truth. I tell him, and I tell all who are canting and whining about the ill-usage he has met with, that, in his actual reply to the long-evaded question, he embodied a serious charge against the *moral principles* of his coadjutors on the October Committee, by asserting their conduct to have been *disingenuous and interested*. Whatever be the issue of the contest, war was proclaimed, and the first blow struck, by Dr. Warren. Even *had* his own motives been attacked, (and they were not,) he has no right to complain of what would only have been a *retort* of his own previous charge.

3. The Doctor, in the most explicit manner, brings against "me and my party," a charge of *the very basest hypocrisy*. He says that he has exposed our "*sinister designs*," which he says are these "Under PRETEXT of a better mode of training our junior Preachers to CONSTRUCT AN ENGINE for more successfully strengthening a dominant episcopal faction." I thank him for this openness. He charges us not with mistake, but with the vilest

hypocrisy possible. To such a charge as this an indignant reply must really be allowed. It could only have been made by a man fully capable of such conduct himself. I most unequivocally, and in the strongest terms in which denial can be expressed, deny being guilty of a line of conduct, in abhorrence of which I will yield neither to the Doctor nor any of his adherents, however loud their professions.

4. Any impartial reader will *now* see, what the original statement of the Doctor was intended to conceal, that his *explicit reply* was not given *at once*. The original statement was simply, "Certain modifications were proposed, and I *at once* stated." It now appears, on the Doctor's own admission, that questions were asked, that his reply was not considered satisfactory, and that something had been said about "disguising sentiments." All this is to be collected from the Doctor's reply; yet at first, all this was concealed, I now say *intentionally* concealed, under, "The modifications were proposed; and I *at once* stated," &c.

5. I now charge Dr. Warren with publishing A DIRECT FALSEHOOD in his present reply. I beg particular attention to this, as it will illustrate the character of *his* regard for veracity. I have said in the paragraphs now before the reader, that Dr. Warren evaded, for above an hour, a direct reply to a certain question. This he unequivocally denies. I will consider his denial bye and bye; but at present, I ask this plain question, What was that inquiry to which I, in my pamphlet, in the very place quoted by the Doctor, and therefore open before him, say that he evaded a reply? Let the reader turn to it, (I have given it above,) and he will see the Doctor's quotation to be contained in the paragraph, and immediately following the question itself. "Mr. Bunting asked whether Dr. Warren were still friendly to *the principle* of the Institution, or whether, since the October meetings, he had changed his opinions." This is the question which I say he evaded; and he has now "the hardihood" (I thank him for that word, and thus throw it back to him) to put the case thus: "The Rev. George Cubitt has the hardihood to say that 'above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought to give an unevasive reply to this plain question,' i. e. *whether I approved of the modified plan of the Institution.*" Whether he evaded or not, *this* is not the question which I *say* he evaded; and, with that question before him, he puts down another, altogether different; and then publishes to the world that I charge him with having evaded a question about which I said nothing at all. This is not only falsehood, but gross, glaring falsehood. Dr. Warren says that I charge him with evading *one* question, knowing, at the same time, (having it before him) that I charged him with evading *another* and *a very different one*.

6. As I am explicitly charged with *a culpable disregard of veracity* in my pamphlet, I demand to be put on my trial before my proper District Meeting. That will bring the matter to a point, and show where this *culpable disregard of veracity* is really to be found.

7. And now, having disposed of these subordinate matters, I come to his explicit denial of my statement. We are now---on one single point, selected by himself, as a specimen of my pamphlet, and thus put forth as decisive of the case,--we are now at issue. I like this. There is no bush-fighting here. I say one thing; the Doctor meets me by direct denial. I have accepted his challenge. Although pressed for time, and labouring under indisposition from a fall which might have been fatal, in direct violation of the injunctions of my medical attendant and friend, I have gone to different persons who were present at the meeting, and procured an attestation of the correctness of my statements, which, I hope, will settle the question as to *this* part of it. When Dr. Warren comes forward with a contradiction, as to any other statement which I have made, I will endeavour to meet him as fairly as I have met him now.

"WE, the undersigned, were present at the Committee-meeting of the 17th of July, to which Mr. Cubitt refers in the paragraphs of his pamphlet above quoted, and thus vouch their correctness."

LANCELOT HASLOPE
JAMES HUNTER
JAMES HOBY
WILLIAM POCOCK
JOSEPH CUSWORTH
ALEXANDER BELL

THEOPHILUS LESSEY
WILLIAM NAYLOR
DANIEL WALTON
THOMAS JACKSON
JOHN BEECHAM
ELIJAH HOOLE.

WESTMINSTER,
November 27th, 1834.

JUST PUBLISHED,

AND SOLD BY LOVE AND BARTON, BOOKSELLERS, MARKET-STREET, AND J. E. STOREY, MARKET-STREET.

	Price.
Defence of the Theological Institution, and of the proceedings of the Institution Committee, &c., in reply to Dr. Warren, by Jonathan Crowther	6d.
Cubitt's Observations on Dr. Warren's Pamphlet against the Wesleyan Institution	6d.
A Candid Address to the Members of the Wesleyan Societies, respecting the late Quarterly Meeting: by William Read	2d.
Touchstone; or, Free Thoughts on the Propriety of establishing a Wesleyan Theological Institution.	1d.
The Exposure; a Reply to "An Address to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Societies"	1d.
Observations on the Rev. J. Bromley's Letter to the Rev. R. Newton	1d.
May be had gratis, on application to the <i>Publishers</i> .	
Declaration of the Wesleyan Methodists of Manchester.	
----- Wesleyan Methodist Preachers of Manchester.	

* * Any of the above Pamphlets, price 1d., are sold for distribution at 7s. per hundred.

LOVE AND BARTON, PRINTERS, MANCHESTER.